

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed April 3, 2009 noted that claims 3-17 were pending, and rejected all claims. Claim 3 and 9 have been amended, claims 7-16 cancelled and new claims 19 and 20 have been added, and, thus, in view of the forgoing claims 3-6, 17, 19 and 20 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below.

Page 2 of the Office Action rejects claims 3-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Oda and Fujioka.

Claim 3 has been amended to emphasize that the automatic teller machine captures, in one image, both the hand of a customer and the upper torso ("where said security camera captures an upper torso of the customer and a hand of the customer inserted into said currency bill receptacle in one image"). This allows a reviewer of the image to have more assurance that the hand being captured in the currency receptacle is that of the customer. The prior art of Oda and/or Fujioka does not capture the hand and the upper torso.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 3 is requested.

The dependent claims depend from the above-discussed independent claims and are patentable over the prior art for the reasons discussed above. The dependent claims also recite additional features not shown to be taught or suggested by the prior art. For example, claim 4 calls for "said security camera operates to capture the image when a count of said time counting means reaches a predetermined time in the state without the sensors in the receptacle having been triggered" (emphasis added). This is in contrast to Oda which executes image processing based on time and says nothing about sensors not being triggered ("Further, in case the card 39, the bankbook 79, and so forth are detected, the CPU 51 starts monitoring a time when the operation is completed, and starts counting time with a built-in timer (not shown). Upon time T exceeding a threshold value .alpha., the CPU 51 causes the photographing apparatus 116 to photograph the face 14, the hand 23, and so forth of the users 11 to 13, respectively, with the camera 117 with the lenses, thereby acquiring an image, and generating image data P4." see Oda, col. 30, lines 20-28). It is submitted that the dependent claims are independently patentable over the prior art.

It is submitted that claims 3-6 and 17 distinguishes over the prior art and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

New claim 19 emphasizes "where said security camera captures an upper torso of the

customer and a hand of the customer inserted into said currency bill receptacle in one image." As discussed above, capturing the hand and upper torso in a same image is not taught by the prior art. New claim 20 emphasizes "where said security camera captures a face of the customer, an upper torso of the customer and a hand of the customer inserted into said currency bill receptacle in one image." Nothing in the prior art teaches or suggests such. It is submitted that these new claims, which are different and not narrower than prior filed claims, distinguish over the prior art.

It is submitted that the claims distinguish over the prior art and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

It is submitted that the claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

If any further fees, other than and except for the issue fee, are necessary with respect to this paper, the U.S.P.T.O. is requested to obtain the same from deposit account number 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 7/2/9

By: /J. Randall Beckers/
J. Randall Beckers
Registration No. 30,358

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501